

**MAY 2003 AGENDA**

SUBJECT	X	ACTION
		INFORMATION
	X	PUBLIC HEARING
Environmental Effect of Proposed Formation of Dixie-Terra Linda Unified School District from Dixie Elementary School District and a Portion of San Rafael City High School District in Marin County		

Recommendation:

Adopt a Negative Declaration (Attachment 1), which indicates no environmental effect.

Summary of Previous State Board of Education Discussion and Action

The State Board of Education has not heard this issue previously.

Summary of Key Issue(s)

Six years ago, the California Resources Agency adopted guidelines that exempted school district organizations from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process. Those guidelines were invalidated in a recent appellate court ruling (*Communities for a Better Environment v. California Resources Agency*, Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C038844).

The State Board of Education is the lead agency for all aspects of school district unifications, including the reinstated CEQA review process. Pursuant to past practice, California Department of Education (CDE) staff conducted an initial study (Attachment 2) and determined that there would be no significant adverse effect on the environment as a result of forming the Dixie-Terra Linda Unified School District. A copy of the Negative Declaration and initial study has been filed with the State Clearinghouse for state agency review (Attachment 3). Also, a legal notice of the May 8, 2003, public hearing has been published in a local newspaper of general circulation. Any comments received by CDE will be forwarded to the Board or presented verbally at the public hearing.

Fiscal Analysis (as appropriate)

There is no fiscal effect to adopting the proposed Negative Declaration.

Attachments

[Attachment 1](#): Negative Declaration (Pages 1-1)

[Attachment 2](#): Environmental Checklist Form (Pages 1-7)

Attachment 3: State Clearinghouse Notification (Pages 1-2) (This attachment not available on the web)

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

1. Name, if any, and a brief description of project: **Formation of Dixie-Terra Linda Unified School District**, which is a unification of the existing Dixie Elementary School District with the corresponding geographic portion of the San Rafael City High School District. This unification also will directly result in the unification of the San Rafael City Elementary School District with the remainder of the San Rafael City High School District.
2. Location: **Marin County**
3. Entity or person undertaking project: **California State Board of Education**

The California State Board of Education, having reviewed the Initial Study of this proposed project, and having reviewed the written comments received prior to the public meeting of the State Board of Education, including the recommendation of the California Department of Education's staff, does hereby find and declare that the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment. A brief statement of the reasons supporting the State Board of Education findings is as follows: **The unification itself will not involve or cause physical changes to the existing environment. Merely changing the political boundaries and the name of a school district (or portion of a school district) will not have an environmental impact.**

The California State Board of Education hereby finds that the Negative Declaration reflects its independent judgment.

A copy of the Initial Study may be obtained at the California Department of Education, 1430 N Street, Suite 3800, Sacramento, CA 95814. Telephone: (916) 322-1468.

The location and custodian of the documents and any other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the California State Board of Education based its decision to adopt this Negative Declaration are as follows:

California Department of Education
1430 N Street, Suite 3800
Sacramento, CA 95814
Telephone: (916) 322-1468

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project title: Formation of Dixie-Terra Linda Unified School District

2. Lead agency name and address:

California State Board of Education

1430 N Street, Suite 5111, Sacramento, CA 95814

3. Contact person and phone number: Larry Shirey, 916 322-1468

4. Project location: San Rafael, Marin County

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

Chief Petitioners

Gregory Stepanicich

Carole Hayashino

Jorge Duran

San Rafael, CA 94903

82 Creekside Drive

1170 Idylberry Road

152 Golden Hinde

6. General plan designation: N/A

7. Zoning: N/A

8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

Change of local governmental structure from elementary/high school districts to unified school district

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: (Briefly describe the project's surroundings)

City of San Rafael, three current school districts – San Rafael Elementary, Dixie Elementary, San Rafael High

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreements.)

N/A

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklists on the following pages.

☐ Land Use and Planning

☐ Transportation/Circulation

☐ Public services

☐ Population and Housing

☐ Biological Resources

☐ Utilities and Service Systems

☐ Geological Problems

☐ Energy and Mineral Resources

☐ Aesthetics

☐ Water

☐ Hazards

☐ Cultural Resources

☐ Air Quality

☐ Noise

☐ Recreation

☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Signature

Date: 11/05/02

Printed name: Larry Shirey

For: California State Board of Education

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 1 5063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVII at the end of the checklist.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated. See the sample question below. A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

7) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different ones.

Sample Question:

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):

Would the proposal result in potential impacts involving:

a) Landslides or mudslides? (1, 6)

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(Attached source list explains 1 is the general plan and 6 is a USGS topo map. This answer would need no further explanation.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. *Would the proposal:*

a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning? (Source #:)

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project? ()

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

c) Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity? ()

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

d) Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? ()

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? ()

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. *Would the proposal:*

a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? ()

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

b) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)? ()

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing? ()

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

III. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS. *Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:*

a) Fault rupture? ()

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

b) Seismic ground shaking? ()

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

c) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction? ()

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

d) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard? ()

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

e) Landslides or mudflows? ()

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

f) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? ()

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

g) Subsidence of land? ()

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

h) Expansive soils? ()

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

i) Unique geologic or physical features? ()

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

IV. WATER. *Would the proposal result in:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g., temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Impacts to groundwater quality? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

V. AIR QUALITY. *Would the proposal:*

a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create objectionable odors? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. *Would the proposal result in:*

a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Insufficient parking capacity onsite or offsite? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. *Would the proposal result in impacts to:*

a) Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian, and vernal pool)? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the proposal:</i>				
a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Use nonrenewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IX. HAZARDS. <i>Would the proposal involve:</i>				
a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation)? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
X. NOISE. <i>Would the proposal result in:</i>				
a) Increases in existing noise levels? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XI. PUBLIC SERVICES. <i>Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:</i>				
a) Fire protection? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other government services? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:</i>				
a) Power or natural gas? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Communications systems? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Sewer or septic tanks? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Storm water drainage? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Solid waste disposal? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Local or regional water supplies? ()	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

XIII. AESTHETICS. *Would the proposal:*

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway? () | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect? () | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Create light or glare? () | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the proposal:*

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Disturb paleontological resources? () | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Disturb archaeological resources? () | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? () | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? () | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

XV. RECREATION. *Would the proposal:*

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities? () | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Affect existing recreational opportunities? () | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

XVII. EARLIER ANALYSES.

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets:

- a) **Earlier analyses used.** Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
- b) **Impacts adequately addressed.** Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

- c) **Mitigation measures.** For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which are incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

Authority: Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21087.

Reference: Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21083, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21151; *Sundstrum v. County of Mendocino*, 202 Cal.App.3d 296 (1988); *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors*, 222 Cal.App.3d 1337 (1990).